

## LAW OFFICES

**BACON & THOMAS**

PATENT TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT CAUSES  
625 SLATERS LANE - FOURTH FLOOR  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314

J. ERNEST KENNEY  
EUGENE MAR  
RICHARD E. FICHTER  
CHARLES R. WOLFE, JR.  
THOMAS J. MOORE  
DAVID E. DOUGHERTY  
BRUCE H. TROXELL  
JOSEPH DEBENEDICTIS  
BENJAMIN E. URCIA  
EVERETT G. DIEDERIKS, JR.  
SUSAN STONE ROSENFELD

\* D.C. BAR  
\* WASHINGTON BAR

TELEPHONE  
(703) 683-0500

FACSIMILE  
(703) 683-1080

TELEX  
88-8124 BATO AQTN

**FACSIMILE COMMUNICATION**

Date: Dec. 3, 1993

To: Examiner Matecki  
Fax # 305-3588, Group 2405  
Re: Serial No. 07/788,801 - Baumgartner et al.  
From: Benjamin E. Urcia, Esq.

FAX COPY RECEIVED  
DEC 03 1993  
GROUP 2400

10

Pages sent including this sheet.

- ☐ Please confirm receipt by return telex or fax.  
☐ Please call sender.  
☐ Confirmation copy follows by ☐ Mail ☐ Courier  
☐

MESSAGE:

FAX COPY RECEIVED  
DEC 03 1993  
GROUP 2400

INFORMAL PROPOSAL--INTERVIEW SCHEDULED FOR  
MONDAY, DEC. 6, 1993 @ 10:00 a.m., Rm. 4-7B20

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Baumgartner et al.

Serial No: 07/788,801

Group Art Unit: 2405

Filed: Nov. 7, 1991

Examiner: Matecki

For: Fishing Reels with a Spool Receiving the Fishing Line

PROPOSED RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116

The Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This paper is in response to the final Office Action dated July 27, 1993. A Petition for a Two-Month Extension of Time together with the appropriate fees accompanies this response so that it is timely filed. Kindly amend the application in accordance with the following particulars:

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend claims 2, 3, 6, and 9 as presented in Appendix A, attached hereto.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. *Why Necessary and Not Earlier Presented/New Issues*

Claims 2 and 9 have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112. The basis for the rejections was that the language of the claims was either confusing or inaccurate. The amendments correct these problems. They do not, however, change the scope of the claims, and therefore do not raise new issues. Instead, they are necessary to overcome the § 112 rejections, and were